

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-27 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 13, 15-18, 23, 24 and 26 are amended, and claims 2, 28 and 29 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 3, 4, 6, 13, 15-18 and 24 are amended for form and for antecedent basis. Support for the amendments to independent claims 1, 23 and 26 can be found at least at the subject matter of canceled claim 2. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Pesin at the interview held August 1, 2006, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

**I. Claims 26-29 Satisfy the Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph**

The Office Action rejects claims 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The rejection of canceled claims 28 and 29 is moot, and the rejection of claims 26 and 27 is traversed. The Office Action asserts that it is unclear whether the generating is done in the projector, or that there is some generating going on based on the received user interface data in the projector. By this Amendment, claim 26 is amended to clarify that the generating occurs in the projector. Thus, as argued during the personal interview, claim 26, and claim 27 depending therefrom, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

**A. §102(b) Rejection of Claims 1-8, 10-12 and 22-25**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8, 10-12 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over JP 2002-023148 to Yasukawa. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, 1-8, 10-12 and 22-25 are not anticipated by Yasukawa. First, Yasukawa does not disclose a projector that includes "an internal image data generating portion for generating user interface image data for display, based on data received via the network connection portion, by executing an application program for the ASP data when the network connection portion determines that the received data is the ASP data," as recited in independent claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent claim 23. That is, the claimed projector determines whether the data received from a server is ASP data, i.e., application service provider data, and if is ASP data, the claimed projector starts an application program and generates data for a user interface screen page for the application program. Yasukawa does not teach or suggest these features.

Yasukawa does not teach or suggest a projector that includes a network connection portion or a transmitting/receiving device that determines whether the received data is the ASP data as recited in independent claims 1 and 23. Yasukawa only discloses a network projector that retrieves data from a server.

Further, Yasukawa does not disclose a projector that includes an internal image generating portion that generates image data for display on the basis of the received data by executing an application program for the ASP data when the received data is the ASP data, as recited in independent claims 1 and 23. That is, Yasukawa does not teach or suggest a projector that executes an application based on data received from a server.

Yasukawa merely discloses reproducing the moving image data received from a server by a browser application. That is, Yasukawa only displays data received from the server as it is. Further, Yasukawa is not capable of generating data for a user interface screen page from the received data. Thus, Yasukawa does not disclose the claimed projector.

Thus, for at least these reasons discussed above and agreed upon during the personal interview, independent claims 1 and 23 are patentable over Yasukawa. Further, claims 2-8,

10-12, 24 and 25 which variously depend from claims 1 and 23, are also patentable over Yasukawa, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 23, 26 and 28, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**B. §102(b) Rejection of Claims 26-29**

The Office Action rejects claims 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,005,534 to Hylin et al. The rejection of canceled claims 28 and 29 is moot, and the rejection of claims 26 and 27 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 26 and 27 are not anticipated by Hylin. Hylin does not disclose a method for displaying images via a projector connected to a network that includes generating, in the projector, image data for display on the basis of the received user interface data by executing an application program for the ASP data when the received user interface data is the ASP data," as recited in independent claim 26.

The combined configuration of a computer and a projector in Hylin only enables a projector to project a project image data received from a station computer (see, e.g., Hylin, col. 5, line 60 - col. 6, line 12). That is, the projector of Hylin is not capable of executing an application program. Thus, Hylin does not disclose the method recited in independent claim 26.

Thus, for at least these reasons discussed above and agreed upon during the personal interview, independent claim 26 is patentable over Hylin. Further, claim 27, which depends from claim 26, is also patentable over Hylin for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 26, as well as for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**C. §103(a) Rejection of Claim 9**

The Office Action rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yasukawa. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 depends from independent claim 1. Thus, claim 9 is patentable over Yasukawa, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully traversed.

**D. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 13 and 14**

The Office Action rejects claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yasukawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,814 to Usami et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 13 and 14 would not have been rendered obvious by Yasukawa in view of Usami because Usami does not remedy the deficiencies of Yasukawa discussed with respect to claim 1. Usami is cited by the Office Action only for its alleged teaching of appending date/time information to image data. Claims 13 and 14 depend from independent claim 1. Thus, claims 13 and 14 are patentable over Yasukawa and Usami for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**E. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 15-20**

The Office Action rejects claims 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yasukawa in view of Usami and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,615,239 to Berstis. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 15-20 would not have been rendered obvious by Yasukawa in view of Usami and Berstis. Berstis does not remedy the deficiencies of Yasukawa and Usami discussed with respect claim 1. Berstis is cited by the Office Action only for its alleged teaching of a configuration that handles HTML data. Claims 15-20 variously depend from independent

claim 1. Thus, claims 15-20 are patentable over Yasukawa, Usami and Berstis for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs  
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/hms

Date: August 22, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--